

RETIREMENT OF SENATOR NANCY KASSEBAUM

Ms. MIKULSKI. Mr. President, I rise to offer my best wishes to our colleague, Senator NANCY KASSEBAUM. Although we will work together for one more year—and I am pleased about that—I want to take this time to express my gratitude to Senator KASSEBAUM for what she has meant to me, to the Labor and Human Resources Committee, and to the Foreign Relations Committee.

First, to me, Senator KASSEBAUM is a real class act. When I came to the U.S. Senate in 1986, Senator KASSEBAUM was the only other woman here. Together we served for 6 years as the only two women in this institution that represents the entire Nation. We were both elected to the U.S. Senate in our own right.

I have tremendous respect for Senator KASSEBAUM and her views on many issues. Senator KASSEBAUM thinks independently in her political and policy decisions. She understands the issues and is not afraid to stand up for what she believes in.

While we may not agree on every issue—no one around here does—we do agree on some pretty important ones. Senator KASSEBAUM favors the legal right to an abortion; she has voted for gun control measures; and she has supported many measures to improve American education. She has demonstrated great courage and conviction.

Second, I salute Senator KASSEBAUM for chairing the full Labor Committee. She is the only female chair of a U.S. Senate committee and she does the job well. I serve on the Labor Committee, and I know first-hand how effective Senator KASSEBAUM can be.

The Labor Committee controls some of the most comprehensive and controversial issues to come before this body. I am talking about welfare reform, health, education, job training and occupational safety—just to name a few. It is not easy. But Senator KASSEBAUM can really rally the troops—Democrat or Republican to make sure that work gets done.

When Senator KASSEBAUM brings a bill to the Senate floor, it is sure to pass. She has a thorough, prudent and reasoned approach to crafting legislation. She gives a great deal of thought to the issues, and she knows how to build consensus.

Together we have fought for the right of women to choice in reproductive health matters. We have fought to keep America healthy, and we have fought for education for this Nation's students.

Finally, as chair of the African Affairs Subcommittee, Senator KASSEBAUM fights for policy that represents our values and respect for human rights.

Senator KASSEBAUM fought apartheid in South Africa. She urged President Reagan to take action against the white-minority government. When he

did not, she courageously endorsed sanctions against South Africa.

I want to thank Senator KASSEBAUM for what she has meant to foreign policy and for her commitment to Africa, to the Nation, and to the people of this country.

Senator KASSEBAUM says “the time has come to pursue other challenges.” I want to wish her the best in that pursuit, and I know that she will set new standards wherever she goes.

THE BAD DEBT BOXSCORE

Mr. HELMS. Mr. President, before discussing today's bad news about the Federal debt, how about “another go,” as the British put it, with our quiz.

The question: How many millions of dollars in a trillion? While you are thinking about it, bear in mind that it was the U.S. Congress that ran up the enormous Federal debt that is now about \$12 billion shy of \$5 trillion.

To be exact, as of the close of business yesterday, November 27, the total Federal debt—down to the penny—stood at \$4,988,885,320,472.65. Another depressing figure means that on a per capita basis, every man, woman, and child in America owes \$18,937.89.

Mr. President, back to our quiz—how many million in a trillion? There are a million million in a trillion, which means that the Federal Government will shortly owe \$5 million million.

Now, who is in favor of balancing the Federal budget?

Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LANDMINES

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I will just speak very briefly. I have spoken many, many times about the dangers of landmines, especially indiscriminate antipersonnel landmines. I was very proud when the Senate went on record by a two-thirds vote supporting my moratorium on our own use of landmines. That is something designed to give the United States the moral leadership in arguing with other nations around the world to eventually ban the use of indiscriminate antipersonnel landmines.

It was, in my 21 years here, one of those rare occasions when people across the ideological spectrum joined together on one major issue, in this case one of the biggest humanitarian issues possible, but also something that could affect defense policies of nations well into the next century.

Earlier today I spoke of the dangers of landmines in the former Yugoslavia.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent an article regarding the debate in

Congress on landmines, written by Bob Kemper of the Washington Bureau of the Chicago Tribune, dated yesterday, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the Chicago Tribune, Nov. 27, 1995]
CONGRESS DEBATES LAND MINE BAN—110 MILLION MINES PLANTED IN 60 NATIONS SPARK OUTCRY

(By Bob Kemper)

They are trash, the debris of war, like burned-out tanks and bombed-out buildings. But long after peace treaties are signed and soldiers go home, land mines go on killing.

Bosnia may provide the latest example. There are an estimated 6 million anti-armor and anti-personnel mines there, only 1 million of which are mapped, according to the United Nations. UN peacekeepers already have suffered 100 casualties from mines in Bosnia.

Killing or maiming 70 people a day worldwide—26,000 each year—land mines are especially devastating to some of the world's poorest countries, according to the State Department and humanitarian groups. And with 110 million mines still buried in more than 60 countries, an international outcry has risen and is echoing in the halls of Congress.

Led by Rep. Lane Evans (D-Ill.), Congress is taking the extraordinary step of ordering the Pentagon to unilaterally disarm itself of anti-personnel mines, devices that in one form or another have been in the U.S. arsenal since the Civil War.

The House and Senate approved a provision in a foreign operations bill that would give the Pentagon three years to learn to fight without anti-personnel mines.

A one-year moratorium, which later could be extended, then would be placed on the use of anti-personnel mines by American forces, except along international borders or in clearly marked fields.

“The U.S. government ought to set a moral example, to lead the world to see the menace of land mines in a clear light,” said Evans, who pushed the proposal in the House while Sen. Patrick J. Leahy (D-Vt.) worked the Senate.

No one is blaming the U.S. military for what the State Department dubbed “the global land mine crisis.” American forces routinely use “smart mines” that self-destruct or turn themselves off after a month or so in the ground. When they do use long-life mines in the field, such as the claymore, the mines are typically removed as the soldiers withdraw.

However, Evans and Leahy say that by disarming its military, America sets an example and can prod other countries to follow suit.

Evans and Leahy used a similar strategy three years ago when they pushed for a moratorium on the U.S. export of mines. Two dozen nations have since followed the U.S. lead in banning or restricting land mine exports. The most recent, France, went further this fall when it announced that it also would stop making mines and destroy those already stockpiled.

Though launched by liberal Democrats, the ban gained new authority on Capitol Hill when pro-defense Democrats, like Virginia Sen. Charles S. Robb, and 25 Republicans, including Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole (R-Kan.), backed it.

“In Vietnam I had a number of my men killed or wounded by various types of mines or booby traps,” said Robb, who had led a Marine platoon. “I have visited around the world, in combat areas, literally tens of

thousands of amputees who were victims of mines and lots of those folks are just children, children who were playing."

Ban proponents say they are singling out the anti-personnel mine because, unlike other implements of war, it keeps killing long after the fighting ends. In Denmark, some areas are still unusable because of mines planted there during World War II.

Many of the 200-plus types of anti-personnel mines manufactured around the world are designed to maim rather than kill because a severely wounded soldier is a bigger drain on enemy logistics and medical resources than a dead soldier. Those same mines, ban proponents argue, are transforming farmers in developing countries into financial and emotional drains on their families and communities.

Still, the Pentagon is fighting to keep the mines.

The Army does not want to give up a weapon on which its field commanders have long relied. Anti-personnel mines are the perfect weapon for defending battlefield positions, protecting economic assets such as power plants, slowing enemy advances or detouring enemy troops into "killing zones."

Worried about the effect on the Army, Senate Armed Services Chairman Strom Thurmond (R-S.C.) and Sen. John Warner (R-Va.), a senior member of that panel, plotted with House Republicans to kill the ban. They intended to place a provision in the defense authorization bill giving the Pentagon veto power over the moratorium. However, Warner said, he dropped that plan after being lobbied by Leahy.

"Let him have his shot at it," Warner said.

One remaining obstacle is the difficulty congressional leaders have had getting the foreign operations bill to the White House. The House and Senate approved the bill in early November, but remain divided over a separate abortion amendment, preventing the bill from moving forward.

Momentum toward a land mine ban has been building since a year ago, when President Clinton called for the eventual elimination of land mines. Three months later, the United Nations approved a U.S. resolution urging action. Last summer, 280 members of the National Conference of Catholic Bishops meeting in Chicago issued a statement singling out land mines as an indiscriminate killer whose production should cease.

Meanwhile, hundreds of humanitarian groups have spent months—and in some cases years—cataloging land mine atrocities and lobbying for a worldwide ban on the manufacture and use of land mines.

But this fall, the push for a ban fizzled when 42 nations at a UN-sponsored conference on conventional weapons failed to reach agreement.

"I don't think there were two minutes of serious discussion * * * on a total ban on land mines," said Stephen Goose, program director of Human Rights Watch's Arms Project and a delegate to the Vienna meeting.

Contrary to Clinton's call for the elimination of mines, many anti-mine groups say, the administration is actually perpetuating the use of mines by pushing for expanded use of "smart mines" rather than backing a total ban.

"There is no technological solution" to the mine problem, Goose said. "A self-destructing or self-deactivating mine is still an indiscriminate mine. It will still deny the fields to the farmer."

Evans said he hopes Congress's action will redirect the administration.

"The President is far too cautious," Evans said. "We're encouraging them to be bolder, to demonstrate leadership in encouraging

other countries" to give up mines altogether.

But Robert Sherman, of the U.S. Arms Control and Disarmament Agency, defended the administration's push for advanced mines and other measures short of a ban, including requiring manufacturers to put at least eight grams of metal into each plastic mine so that they can be more easily detected. Such steps are a much more realistic way to protect civilians, he said.

"We know there will not be a total ban in 1996 or 1997 or whenever," Sherman said. "If mines are your concern, you say this is bad. If people are your concern, you say this is good."

Anti-mine advocates argue that "smart mines" often fail to self-destruct, compounding—rather than solving—what is already a daunting problem globally: detection and removal of mines.

Some anti-personnel mines sell for as little as \$2 to \$3 and hundreds of them can be planted in seconds by special artillery or trucks. In contrast, it takes 100 times longer to remove a mine at a cost of up to \$1,000 per mine. And that's if the mine can be found.

Many modern mines are as small as a can of shoe polish and made of plastic. Their only metal part is the size of a thumbtack, making detection by the 1940s-style mine-sweepers, still in use today, nearly impossible.

Also, for every mine removed, 20 more are planted. In 1993, the UN estimated that 100,000 land mines were found and removed at a cost of \$70 million. During that time, 2 million more mines were laid. Even if no more mines were planted after today, experts said, it would take decades and at least \$33 billion to clear those still in the ground.

The State Department and the Vietnam Veterans of America, in separate studies, found that mines left behind after wars have taken a devastating toll on civilians. Once fertile fields are now too dangerous to plow. Cattle are killed or maimed. Roads and major utilities hampered by mines make producing and shipping goods difficult.

"Without a clear statement by the U.S. that demonstrates that we are opposed to their use, other nations will continue to sell and deploy them," Evans said. "This legislation, like the moratorium on exports, calls a 'time out' and puts us in the leadership position to challenge other nations to work with us and solve this global crisis."

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, are we in morning business?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Yes, sir, we are.

Mr. DORGAN. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Mr. DORGAN pertaining to the introduction of S. 1427 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

THE RECONCILIATION BILL

Mr. DORGAN. Mr. President, the current Presiding Officer has spent substantial amounts of time on the floor

talking about reconciliation, and he feels passionately and strongly, I believe, that we ought to balance the Federal budget. I share that with him. There is not disagreement in this Chamber about the goal.

I said back home last week—and I have said here—that in my judgment the Republicans deserve some praise for pushing and pushing for a balanced budget. I commend them for that. I do not commend them for the priorities on how they would get there. But, frankly, all of us ought to have more inertia to try to put this country's books in order. And the question is not whether. The question is, How are we going to balance the budget in 7 years?

Negotiations will begin today or tomorrow between the Republicans in the Congress and the Democrats in the White House on how to do that in 7 years. I would simply ask the American people, and my colleagues in the Senate, to think through these priorities some because it is not just let us do it in 7 years and never mind the consequences. It is, let us do it in 7 years. Let us do it the right way, and the smart way for this country. Let us make the right choices for this country's future. It is not the only job in front of us. We should balance the budget. We must, and we will balance the budget. But we also must make sure that those who are disadvantaged in this country are not ignored. We must make sure that our education system works, and we must make sure that our air is clean and our water is clean. Those are other priorities as well.

But in the terms of choosing priorities by which we balance the budget, I would like to once again demonstrate that there is substantial difference and a legitimate difference in what we think will enhance our country's long-term interests. I happen to think that there is nothing more important in this country than investing in building the best education system in the world. I want, when all of this is said and done, for us to be able to say our generation, this group of Americans, made a commitment that we want to have the finest schools in the world. We want our kids to be the best they can be because they went to the best schools in the world. There is a little provision in the reconciliation bill, and the continuing resolution that was passed a week and a half ago, a tiny little issue called Star Schools.

It is a tiny little program, but it is designed to try to lift and enhance those schools that are focusing on math and sciences to bring our children up to international levels in math and sciences, to be competitive. This little Star Schools Program was cut 40 percent—40 percent.

Now, there is a bigger program, a kind of a giant tumor over in the Defense Department called star wars or national missile defense or SDI, depending on what name you want to call it. Because this proposal has a space-